

April 21, 2009

GIBBS RANDOM FIELDS WITH UNBOUNDED SPINS ON UNBOUNDED DEGREE GRAPHS

YURI KONDRATIEV, YURI KOZITSKY, AND TANJA PASUREK

ABSTRACT. Gibbs random fields corresponding to systems of real-valued spins (e.g. systems of interacting anharmonic oscillators) indexed by the vertices of unbounded degree graphs with a certain summability property are constructed. It is proven that the set of tempered Gibbs random fields is non-void and weakly compact, and that they obey uniform exponential integrability estimates. In the second part of the paper, a class of graphs is described in which the mentioned summability is obtained as a consequence of a property, by virtue of which vertices of large degree are located at large distances from each other. The latter is a stronger version of a metric property, introduced in [Bassalygo, L. A. and Dobrushin, R. L. (1986). Uniqueness of a Gibbs field with a random potential—an elementary approach. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **31** 572–589].

1. INTRODUCTION AND PAPER OVERVIEW

1.1. Introduction. Gibbs random fields on a discrete metric space (e.g. on a graph) can be viewed as collections of dependent random variables, usually called *spins*, indexed by the elements of this space. Their joint probability laws are defined by the families of local conditional distributions constructed by means of interaction potentials. We quote the monographs (10; 11) as standard sources in the theory of such fields. Each spin takes values in the corresponding *single-spin* space, say $\mathcal{X}_x$. Most of Gibbs random fields constructed on general graphs correspond to models with finite single-spin spaces. Perhaps, the most known example is the Ising model where $\mathcal{X}_x = \{-1, 1\}$ for all x . By the compactness of $\mathcal{X}_x$, such Gibbs fields exist for arbitrary graphs, see (11; 13; 14; 17; 18; 22). Their properties are closely related to those of random walks or corresponding percolation models, see e.g. (13; 17; 18). The development of the theory of Gibbs random fields with unbounded spins, started in the late seventies in the pioneering works (16; 6), was strongly motivated by physical applications, especially, in Euclidean quantum field theory, see e.g. (20). Since that time, such random fields were extensively studied, see e.g. the bibliographical notes in (19). However,

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60K35; 82B20; 05C07.

Key words and phrases. Gibbs measure; Gibbs specification; DLR equation; unbounded spin; unbounded degree graph; generalized Randić index.

This work was financially supported by the DFG through SFB 701: “Spektrale Strukturen und Topologische Methoden in der Mathematik” and through the research project 436 POL 125/0-1. Yuri Kozitsky was also supported by TODEQ MTKD-CT-2005-030042.

the results obtained in all these works were restricted to the case where the underlying metric space is a simple cubic lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$. In (15; 19), the theory of Gibbs random fields was extended to unbounded spin systems living on more general discrete metric spaces, including graphs of bounded degree. In this context, we mention also the paper (12) where a Gaussian field on a bounded degree graph was studied.

In the present paper, we construct Gibbs random fields with unbounded spins ($\mathcal{X}_x = \mathbb{R}$ for all x) on unbounded degree graphs of certain kind and analyze the role played here by the geometry of the graph. In doing so, we are motivated by the following reasons:

- Random fields on Riemannian manifolds, especially those associated with the corresponding Laplace-Beltrami operators, cf. (8), can be approximated by their discrete versions living on appropriate graphs (9). This includes also the case of quantum fields in curved space-time, see (2; 21).
- As the degree of the graph can be related to such a property of the corresponding manifold as curvature, the use of unbounded degree graphs essentially extends the class of manifolds that can be approximated in the above sense.
- Another application can be the description of systems of interacting oscillators located at vertices of an infinite graph – the so called oscillating networks, see Section 14 in (4). We refer also to the survey (5), where other relevant physical models can be found.

The results of the paper are: (a) constructing Gibbs random fields; (b) deriving exponential integrability estimates and support properties for such fields; (c) presenting a concrete family of unbounded degree graphs, which can serve as underlying graphs for our model. In achieving (a) and (b), we used a modification of the technique developed in (15; 19). In constructing the family of (c) we were inspired by some aspects of (3). To the best of our knowledge, the present study is the first attempt in such a direction. We plan to continue investigating the model introduced here in forthcoming papers. In particular, we are going to study the problem of uniqueness of Gibbs random fields, as well as the ergodicity properties of the corresponding stochastic dynamics.

1.2. The paper overview. The model we deal with in this paper is the triple (G, W, V) , where $G = (V, E)$ is a graph, $W : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $V : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous functions (potentials). The properties of the triple (G, W, V) are specified below in Assumption 2.1, see also (3.1). This triple determines the heuristic Hamiltonian

$$(1.1) \quad H(\omega) = \sum_{\langle x, y \rangle} W(\omega(x), \omega(y)) + \sum_x V(\omega(x)),$$

where the first (resp. second) sum is taken over all edges (resp. vertices) of the graph. For this model, Gibbs random fields are defined as probability measures on the configuration space $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^V$. In contrast to the case of bounded spins, it is unrealistic to describe all Gibbs measures of an unbounded spin system without assuming a priori any of its properties. Thus, among all Gibbs measures corresponding to (1.1) we distinguish those that have a prescribed support property, i.e., such that $\mu(\Omega^t) = 1$ for an a priori chosen proper subset $\Omega^t \subset \Omega$. These measures are called *tempered*. In Theorem 2.3, we show that the set of tempered Gibbs measures $\mathcal{G}^t$ is non-void and weakly compact. Here we also show that each $\mu \in \mathcal{G}^t$ obeys important integrability estimates, the same for all such measures. In Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, these results are extended in the following directions: (a) we allow the potential W to be super-quadratic, see (3.1); (b) we consider a scale of sets of tempered Gibbs measures, which clarifies connections between the graph geometry and the properties of such measures. These our results are valid for any graph possessing the summability specified in Assumption 2.1. To provide a nontrivial example of unbounded degree graphs with this property, in the second part of the paper we introduce a new class of such graphs, which we believe is interesting in its own right. This class is characterized by the following property, cf. (5.3) and (5.2). For vertices x and y , such that their degrees, $n(x)$ and $n(y)$, exceed some threshold value, the path distance is supposed to obey the ‘repulsion’ condition

$$(1.2) \quad \rho(x, y) \geq \phi[\max\{n(x), n(y)\}],$$

where ϕ is a given increasing function. In such graphs, every vertex x has the property that

$$\sup_{y: \rho(x, y) \leq N} n(y) \leq \phi^{-1}(2N),$$

whenever N exceeds some N_x , specific for this x . By means of this property, for $\phi(b) = v \log b [\log \log b]^{1+\varepsilon}$, $v, \varepsilon > 0$, we obtain the estimate

$$\sum_{y: \rho(x, y) = N} [n(y)]^{1+\theta} \leq \exp(aN),$$

which holds for any $\theta > 0$ and an appropriate $a > 0$, whenever $N \geq N_x$. In Theorem 5.2, we show that the latter estimate implies the required summability (2.3).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the first part, the emphasis is put on the probabilistic stuff, whereas the second part – Section 5 – is devoted to the graph-theoretical aspects of the problem. In Section 2, we specify the class of models by imposing conditions on the graph and on the potentials. The only essential condition imposed on G is the summability (2.3). The potentials are supposed to obey quite standard stability requirements, plus continuity. We note, however, that the stability condition (2.5) is a bit stronger than the one with $q = 2$, typical for graphs of bounded degree. In view of this fact, the Gaussian case is not covered

by our theory. Thereafter, we put forward Theorem 2.3. In Section 3, we present Theorems 3.1 and 3.2. The proof of the latter theorem follows from the estimates obtained in Theorem 3.1. The proof of Theorem 3.1, which is the main technical component of the first part of the paper, is given in Section 4. It is preceded by a number of lemmas, in which we elaborate the corresponding tools. The key element here is Lemma 4.2 the proof of which crucially employs the summability (2.3). In Section 5, we introduce and describe the class of graphs with the property (1.2), which by Theorem 5.2 can serve as underlying graphs for our model.

2. THE SETUP AND THE BASIC THEOREM

2.1. The model. The underlying graph $G = (V, E)$ of the model (1.1) is supposed to be undirected and countable. Two adjacent vertices $x, y \in V$ are also called neighbors. In this case, we write $x \sim y$ and $\langle x, y \rangle \in E$. The *degree* of $x \in V$, denoted by $n(x)$, is the cardinality of the neighborhood of x , that is, of the set $\{y \mid y \sim x\}$. We use the shorthand

$$\sum_x = \sum_{x \in V} \quad \sup_x = \sup_{x \in V} \quad \sum_{y \sim x} = \sum_{y \in V: y \sim x}.$$

The graph is assumed to be *locally finite*, which means that $n(x) \in \mathbb{N}$ for any x . At the same time, we assume that $\sup_x n(x) = +\infty$, which is reflected in the title of the paper. Of course, our results are trivially valid for bounded degree graphs.

A sequence $\vartheta = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, such that $x_k \sim x_{k+1}$ for all $k = 0, \dots, n-1$, is called a *path*. Herein, some of the vertices may be repeated. The path connects its *endpoints* x_0 and x_n ; it *leaves* the vertices $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}$ and *enters* $x_1, \dots, x_n$. The number of left vertices, denoted by $\|\vartheta\|$, is called the *length* of the path. For $x, y \in V$, by $\vartheta(x, y)$ we denote a path, whose endpoints are x and y . We assume that G is connected, which means that there exists a path $\vartheta(x, y)$ for every x and y . The path distance $\rho(x, y)$ is set to be the length of the shortest $\vartheta(x, y)$. It is a metric on G by means of which, for a certain $o \in V$ and $\alpha > 0$, we define

$$(2.1) \quad w_\alpha(x) = \exp[-\alpha\rho(o, x)], \quad x \in V.$$

For $\theta > 0$, we also set¹

$$(2.2) \quad m_\theta(x) = \sum_{y \sim x} [n(x)n(y)]^\theta, \quad x \in V.$$

The remaining properties of the model are summarized in

Assumption 2.1. *The triple (G, W, V) is subject to the following conditions:*

¹In mathematical chemistry, the sum of terms $[n(x)n(y)]^\theta$ taken over the edges $\langle x, y \rangle$ of a finite tree is known under the name *generalized Randić* or *connectivity* index, see e.g. (7).

(i) the graph G is such that, for some positive α and θ ,

$$(2.3) \quad \Theta(\alpha, \theta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_x m_\theta(x) w_\alpha(x) < \infty;$$

(ii) the function W is continuous, symmetric, and such that

$$(2.4) \quad |W(u, v)| \leq [I_W + J_W(u^2 + v^2)]/2,$$

for some $I_W, J_W > 0$ and all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$;

(iii) the function V is continuous and such that, for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(2.5) \quad V(u) \geq a_V |u|^q - c_V,$$

for some $a_V, c_V > 0$ and $q > 2 + 2/\theta$, with θ being the same as in (i).

2.2. The basic result. Following the standard DLR route, see (10), the Gibbs random fields for our model are defined as probability measures on the measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$. Here $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^V$ is the configuration space, equipped with the product topology and with the corresponding Borel σ -field $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$. By $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ we denote the space of all probability measures on $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$, which is equipped with the weak topology determined by bounded continuous functions $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. By $C_b(\Omega)$ we denote the set of all such functions.

In the sequel, by writing $\Lambda \Subset V$ we mean that Λ is a finite and non-void set of vertices. A property related to such a subset is called *local*. As usual, $\Lambda^c = V \setminus \Lambda$ stands for the complement of $\Lambda \subset V$.

For $\Lambda \Subset V$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, by ω_Λ we denote the restriction of ω to Λ , and use the decomposition $\omega = \omega_\Lambda \times \omega_{\Lambda^c}$. Then for such Λ and a fixed $\xi \in \Omega$, the relative local Hamiltonian is set to be

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} H_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda | \xi) &= \sum_{\langle x, y \rangle: x, y \in \Lambda} W(\omega(x), \omega(y)) \\ &+ \sum_{\langle x, y \rangle: x \in \Lambda, y \in \Lambda^c} W(\omega(x), \xi(y)) + \sum_{x \in \Lambda} V(\omega(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Thereby, for $\Lambda \Subset V$, $\xi \in \Omega$, and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$, we define

$$(2.7) \quad \pi_\Lambda(A | \xi) = \frac{1}{Z_\Lambda(\xi)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{|\Lambda|}} \mathbb{I}_A(\omega_\Lambda \times \xi_{\Lambda^c}) \exp[-H_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda | \xi)] d\omega_\Lambda,$$

where $\mathbb{I}_A$ is the indicator function, $d\omega_\Lambda$ is the corresponding Lebesgue measure on the Euclidean space $\Omega_\Lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{R}^{|\Lambda|}$, and $Z_\Lambda(\xi)$ is a normalizing factor. Hence, each $\pi_\Lambda(\cdot | \xi) \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. The family $\{\pi_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda \Subset V}$ is called the *local Gibbs specification* for the model we consider. Directly from the definition (2.7), one makes sure that this family is consistent in the following sense:

$$(2.8) \quad \int_\Omega \pi_\Delta(A | \omega) \pi_\Lambda(d\omega | \xi) = \pi_\Lambda(A | \xi),$$

which holds for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$, all $\Delta \subset \Lambda$, and all $\Lambda \in \mathbb{V}$.

Definition 2.2. A measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ is said to be a Gibbs random field corresponding to the Hamiltonian (1.1) if it solves the following (DLR) equation

$$(2.9) \quad \mu(A) = \int_{\Omega} \pi_{\Lambda}(A|\omega) \mu(d\omega),$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ and $\Lambda \in \mathbb{V}$.

An equivalent version of (2.9) is the following equation

$$(2.10) \quad \mu(f) = \int_{\Omega} \pi_{\Lambda}(f|\omega) \mu(d\omega),$$

which ought to hold for all $f \in C_b(\Omega)$ and $\Lambda \in \mathbb{V}$. Here, for such f and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, we use the notation

$$\mu(f) = \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) \mu(d\omega).$$

Let $\mathcal{G}$ stand for the set of all solutions of (2.9). As is typical for unbounded spin systems, it is far from being obvious whether $\mathcal{G}$ is non-void. But if it is the case, the description of properties possessed by all the elements of $\mathcal{G}$ is rather unrealistic. Thus, one constructs and studies a subset of $\mathcal{G}$, consisting of the measures possessing a prescribed (support) property. Such measures are called *tempered*.

For positive p and α , we set

$$(2.11) \quad \|\omega\|_{p,\alpha} = \left[\sum_{x \in \mathbb{V}} |\omega(x)|^p w_{\alpha}(x) \right]^{1/p},$$

where the weights w_{α} are defined in (2.3). Then

$$L^p(\mathbb{V}, w_{\alpha}) = \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{V}} \mid \|\omega\|_{p,\alpha} < \infty\},$$

is a Banach space. For θ and q being as in (2.3) and in (2.5), respectively, we fix

$$(2.12) \quad p = 2 + 2/\theta < q.$$

For this p , the set of *tempered* configurations is set to be

$$(2.13) \quad \Omega^t = L^p(\mathbb{V}, w_{\alpha}),$$

where α is as in (2.3). Clearly, $\Omega^t \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$; hence, one can define

$$(2.14) \quad \mathcal{G}^t = \{\mu \in \mathcal{G} \mid \mu(\Omega^t) = 1\}.$$

Theorem 2.3 (BASIC). *The set $\mathcal{G}^t$ is non-void and weakly compact. For every $\lambda > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{V}$, there exists a positive constant $C(\lambda, x)$, such that, for all $\mu \in \mathcal{G}^t$,*

$$(2.15) \quad \int_{\Omega} \exp(\lambda |\omega(x)|^p) \mu(d\omega) \leq C(\lambda, x).$$

Furthermore, for every $\lambda > 0$, there exists a positive constant $C(\lambda)$, such that, for all $\mu \in \mathcal{G}^t$,

$$(2.16) \quad \int_{\Omega} \exp(\lambda \|\omega\|_{p,\alpha}^p) \mu(d\omega) \leq C(\lambda).$$

Herein, α and p are the same as in (2.13).

3. EXTENSIONS

3.1. More on temperedness. In this subsection, Theorem 2.3 is extended in the following directions: (a) we allow a super-quadratic growth of the potential W , cf. (2.4); (b) we construct a scale of sets of tempered Gibbs fields, the elements of which obey integrability estimates, stronger than (2.15) and (2.16).

In what follows, instead of (2.4) we assume

$$(3.1) \quad |W(u, v)| \leq [I_W + J_W(|u|^r + |v|^r)]/2,$$

for some $r > 0$. The potential V is assumed to obey (2.5) with $q > r + r/\theta$, where θ is as in (2.3). The graph G is supposed to be the same as in Assumption 2.1. The scale of tempered Gibbs fields which we are going to construct will be indexed by α and p . First, we set

$$(3.2) \quad \underline{\alpha} = \inf\{\alpha \mid \Theta(\alpha, \theta) < \infty\},$$

and let $\bar{\alpha} > \underline{\alpha}$ be such that (2.3) holds for all $\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$. Next, we define

$$(3.3) \quad p_0 = r + r/\theta.$$

For $\alpha', \alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ and $p', p \in [p_0, q)$, by (2.11) we have

$$(3.4) \quad L^{p'}(\mathbf{V}, w_{\alpha'}) \hookrightarrow L^p(\mathbf{V}, w_{\alpha}), \quad \text{whenever } \alpha' \leq \alpha \text{ and } p' \geq p.$$

Notably, the above embedding is compact. Then, for $\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ and $p \in [p_0, q)$, we set, cf. (2.14),

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{G}_{p,\alpha} = \{\mu \in \mathcal{G} \mid \mu[L^p(\mathbf{V}, w_{\alpha})] = 1\}.$$

Clearly

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{G}_{p',\alpha'} \subset \mathcal{G}_{p,\alpha}, \quad \text{whenever } \alpha' \leq \alpha \text{ and } p' \geq p.$$

The following statement is an extended version of Theorem 2.3.

Theorem 3.1 (EXTENDED). *For every $\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ and $p \in [p_0, q)$, the set $\mathcal{G}_{p,\alpha}$ is non-void and weakly compact. For every $\lambda > 0$ and $x \in \mathbf{V}$, there exists a positive constant $C(p, \alpha; \lambda, x)$, such that, for all $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_{p,\alpha}$,*

$$(3.7) \quad \int_{\Omega} \exp(\lambda |\omega(x)|^p) \mu(d\omega) \leq C(p, \alpha; \lambda, x).$$

Furthermore, for every $\lambda > 0$, there exists a positive constant $C(p, \alpha; \lambda)$, such that, for all $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_{p,\alpha}$,

$$(3.8) \quad \int_{\Omega} \exp(\lambda \|\omega\|_{p,\alpha}^p) \mu(d\omega) \leq C(p, \alpha; \lambda).$$

Let us make some comments.

- For our graphs, one cannot expect that the constants $C(p, \alpha; \lambda, x)$ in (3.7) are bounded uniformly in x . This could be the case if the quantities $\Theta(\alpha, \theta)$ were bounded uniformly with respect to the choice of the root o .
- Both estimates (3.7) and (3.8) hold also for $p = q$ but not for all λ , which should be small enough in this case.
- The interval $[p_0, q)$ is non-void if $q > r + r/\theta$, i.e., if the stabilizing effect of the potential V is stronger than the destabilizing effects of the interaction and of the underlying graph, caused by its degree property. If the graph is of bounded degree $\bar{n} = \sup_x n(x)$, the condition (2.3) is satisfied for any $\theta > 0$ and $\alpha > \log \bar{n}$. In this case, one can take θ arbitrarily big and get $q > r$ (or $q \geq r$ for small λ), which is typical for such situations.
- According to (2.11) and (3.6), the stronger estimates we want to get, the smaller class of tempered Gibbs random fields we obtain.
- In view of the specific features of the graph geometry, such as the degree unboundedness and the lack of transitivity, the two basic statistical-mechanical tools – Ruelle’s superstability method and Dobrushin’s existence and uniqueness criteria – are not applicable to our model.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 will be done in Section 4. Theorem 2.3 is obtained therefrom as a particular case of $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}$, $p = p_0$, and $r = 2$.

3.2. More on weak compactness. Taking into account (3.4), we define

$$(3.9) \quad \tilde{\Omega}^t = \bigcap_{p \in [p_0, q)} \bigcap_{\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} L^p(\mathbf{V}, w_\alpha).$$

This set can be endowed with the projective limit topology and thereby turned into a Fréchet space. By standard arguments, its Borel σ -field $\mathcal{B}(\tilde{\Omega}^t)$ has the property

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\Omega}^t) = \{A \cap \tilde{\Omega}^t \mid A \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)\},$$

in view of which, we can define, cf. (2.14),

$$(3.11) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{G}}^t = \{\mu \in \mathcal{G} \mid \mu(\tilde{\Omega}^t) = 1\}.$$

The elements of the latter set have the smallest support we have managed to establish. In view of (3.10), they can be redefined as probability measures on $(\tilde{\Omega}^t, \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\Omega}^t))$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}^t$ be the weak topology on the set of all probability measures $\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\Omega}^t)$. Clearly, $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}^t$ is stronger than the topology mentioned in Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.2. *The set $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}^t$ is non-void and $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}^t$ -compact.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ be the intersection of all $\mathcal{G}_{p,\alpha}$, with $\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ and $p \in [p_0, q)$, see (3.9). By compactness established in Theorem 3.1 the set $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is non-void. Obviously, all its elements belong to $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}^t$ and hence these two sets coincide. Furthermore, the elements of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ obey the estimates (3.7), (3.8) with all $\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ and $p \in [p_0, q)$.

Let us now prove the stated $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}^t$ -compactness. To this end we consider the balls

$$(3.12) \quad B_{p,\alpha}(R) = \{\omega \mid \|\omega\|_{p,\alpha} \leq R\}, \quad R > 0,$$

and fix two monotone sequences $\alpha_k \downarrow \underline{\alpha}$ and $p_k \uparrow q$, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. In view of (3.8), for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, one can pick $R_{k,\epsilon} > 0$ such that,

$$\mu[B_{p_k,\alpha_k}(R_{k,\epsilon})] \geq 1 - \epsilon/2^k,$$

uniformly for all $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_{p_k,\alpha_k}$, and hence for all $\mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}^t$. By the compactness of the embedding (3.4), the set

$$B = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} B_{p_k,\alpha_k}(R_{k,\epsilon})$$

is compact in $\tilde{\Omega}^t$, and is such that $\mu(B) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for all $\mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}^t$. Thereafter, the $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}^t$ -compactness of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}^t$ follows by the renowned Prokhorov theorem. $\square$

3.3. Gibbs states of systems of anharmonic oscillators. The Gibbs random fields constructed above can serve as equilibrium thermodynamic states of systems of one-dimensional anharmonic oscillators, indexed by the vertices of $\mathbf{G}$ and interacting with each other along the edges by the potential W (oscillating networks). Obviously, Theorem 2.3 holds true if one replaces the single-spin space $\mathbb{R}$ with $\mathbb{R}^\nu$, $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, which would correspond to multi-dimensional oscillators. Furthermore, by means of the technique developed in (1; 15; 19) this theorem can also be extended to the case where the single-spin spaces are copies of C_β – the Banach space of continuous functions (temperature loops) $\omega : [0, \beta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$, $\beta > 0$, such that $\omega(0) = \omega(\beta)$. In this case, the Gibbs random fields correspond to the so called *Euclidean* thermodynamic Gibbs states of a system of interacting ν -dimensional quantum anharmonic oscillators, for which β^{-1} is temperature.

4. PROPERTIES OF THE LOCAL GIBBS SPECIFICATION

In this section, we prove that the estimate (3.8) holds also for all $\pi_\Lambda(\cdot|\xi)$. This will imply all the properties of the family $\{\pi_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda \in \mathbf{V}}$ which we need to prove Theorem 3.1. We begin by deriving a basic estimate, which allows us to control the ξ -dependence of moments of π_Λ with one-point $\Lambda = \{x\}$. Its extension to arbitrary Λ 's will be obtained by means of the consistency property (2.8).

4.1. Moment estimates. From (3.1), by an easy calculation we get

$$(4.1) \quad |W(u, v)| \leq \varkappa(|u|^p + |v|^p) + I_W/2 + 2(p-r) \left(\frac{J_W}{2p}\right)^{p/(p-r)} \left(\frac{r}{\varkappa}\right)^{r/(p-r)},$$

which holds for all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\varkappa > 0$, $p > r$. We will use this estimate with $\varkappa = \beta/n(x)n(y)$, $x, y \in \mathbf{V}$, $\beta > 0$. For such β and $p \in [p_0, q)$, we set

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \Gamma_{xy}(\beta, p) &= \gamma(\beta, p)[n(x)n(y)]^{r/(p-r)}, \\ \gamma(\beta, p) &= I_W + 4(p-r) \left(\frac{J_W}{2p}\right)^{p/(p-r)} \left(\frac{r}{\beta}\right)^{r/(p-r)}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} C(\beta, \lambda, p) &= c_V + \log \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp((\lambda + \beta)|u|^p - a_V|u|^q) du \right\} \\ &\quad - \log \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(-\beta|u|^p - V(u)) du \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda > 0$ and a_V , c_V , and q are the same as in (2.5) and (2.12). Note that the integral in the latter line is positive. In the lemma below, π_x and Z_x stand for the corresponding objects defined in (2.7) with $\Lambda = \{x\}$.

Lemma 4.1. *For every $\lambda > 0$, $p \in [p_0, q)$, $x \in \mathbf{V}$, and $\xi \in \Omega$, the following estimate holds*

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} \exp(\lambda|\omega(x)|^p) \pi_x(d\omega|\xi) \\ &\leq \exp \left(C(\beta, \lambda, p) + \sum_{y \sim x} \frac{2\beta|\xi(y)|^p}{n(x)n(y)} + \sum_{y \sim x} \Gamma_{xy}(\beta, p) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By (4.1), with $\varkappa = \beta/n(x)n(y)$, and (4.2) the relative Hamiltonian (2.6) with $\Lambda = \{x\}$ can be estimated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &-\sum_{y \sim x} \left[\frac{\beta}{n(x)n(y)} (|\omega(x)|^p + |\xi(y)|^p) + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_{xy}(\beta, p) \right] - V(\omega(x)) \\ &\leq -H_x(\omega(x)|\xi) \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{y \sim x} \left[\frac{\beta}{n(x)n(y)} (|\omega(x)|^p + |\xi(y)|^p) + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_{xy}(\beta, p) \right] \\ &\quad - a_V |\omega(x)|^q + c_V. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} Z_x(\xi) &\geq \exp \left\{ - \sum_{y \sim x} \left[\frac{\beta |\xi(y)|^p}{n(x)n(y)} + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_{xy}(\beta, p) \right] \right\} \\ &\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp [-\beta |\omega(x)|^p - V(\omega(x))] d\omega(x), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp [\lambda |\omega(x)|^p - H_x(\omega(x)|\xi)] d\omega(x) \\ &\leq \exp \left\{ c_V + \sum_{y \sim x} \left[\frac{\beta |\xi(y)|^p}{n(x)n(y)} + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_{xy}(\beta, p) \right] \right\} \\ &\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp [(\lambda + \beta) |\omega(x)|^p - a_V |\omega(x)|^q] d\omega(x), \end{aligned}$$

which clearly yields (4.4). $\square$

Now, for $\lambda > 0$, $p \in [p_0, q)$, $\Lambda \in \mathcal{V}$, and a fixed $x \in \Lambda$, we set

$$(4.5) \quad M_x(\lambda, p, \Lambda; \xi) = \log \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \exp (\lambda |\omega(x)|^p) \pi_{\Lambda}(d\omega|\xi) \right\},$$

which is obviously finite. Our aim is to find an upper bound for this quantity. Integrating both sides of (4.4) with respect to $\pi_{\Lambda}(\cdot|\xi)$ and taking into account (2.8) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (4.6) \quad \exp [M_x(\lambda, p, \Lambda; \xi)] &\leq \exp \left(C(\beta, \lambda, p) + \sum_{y \sim x} \Gamma_{xy}(\beta, p) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{y \sim x, y \in \Lambda^c} \frac{2\beta |\xi(y)|^p}{n(x)n(y)} \right) \\ &\quad \times \int_{\Omega} \exp \left(\sum_{y \sim x, y \in \Lambda} \frac{2\beta |\omega(y)|^p}{n(x)n(y)} \right) \pi_{\Lambda}(d\omega|\xi). \end{aligned}$$

In the sequel, the parameter $\bar{\alpha}$ will be fixed. Then for a given λ , the parameter β will always be chosen in such a way that

$$(4.7) \quad 2\beta e^{\bar{\alpha}} < \lambda,$$

which, in particular, yields

$$(4.8) \quad \sum_{y \sim x} \frac{2\beta}{\lambda n(x)n(y)} \leq 1.$$

To estimate the integral in the latter line in (4.6) we use the multiple Hölder inequality

$$(4.9) \quad \int \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \varphi_i^{\alpha_i} \right) d\mu \leq \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\int \varphi_i d\mu \right)^{\alpha_i},$$

in which μ is a probability measure, $\varphi_i \geq 0$ (respectively, $\alpha_i \geq 0$), $i = 1, \dots, n$, are integrable functions (respectively, numbers such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \leq 1$). Applying this inequality in (4.6) and taking into account (4.8) we arrive at

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} M_x(\lambda, p, \Lambda; \xi) &\leq C(\beta, \lambda, p) + \sum_{y \sim x} \Gamma_{xy}(\beta, p) + \sum_{y \sim x, y \in \Lambda^c} \frac{2\beta |\xi(y)|^p}{n(x)n(y)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{y \sim x, y \in \Lambda} \frac{2\beta}{\lambda n(x)n(y)} M_y(\lambda, p, \Lambda; \xi). \end{aligned}$$

As the quantity we want to estimate appears in both sides of the latter estimate, we make the following. For $\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$, we set, cf. (2.1) and (2.11),

$$(4.11) \quad \|M(\lambda, p, \Lambda; \xi)\|_\alpha = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} M_x(\lambda, p, \Lambda; \xi) \exp[-\alpha \rho(o, x)],$$

and obtain an upper bound for $\|M(\lambda, p, \Lambda; \xi)\|_\alpha$. To this end we multiply both sides of (4.10) by $\exp[-\alpha \rho(o, x)]$ and sum over $x \in \Lambda$. This leads us to

$$(4.12) \quad \|M(\lambda, p, \Lambda; \xi)\|_\alpha \leq \mathcal{R}_1^\alpha + \mathcal{R}_2^\alpha + \mathcal{R}_3^\alpha(\Lambda) + \mathcal{R}_4^\alpha(\Lambda).$$

Here

$$(4.13) \quad \mathcal{R}_1^\alpha = C(\beta, \lambda, p) \sum_x \exp[-\alpha \rho(o, x)],$$

and

$$(4.14) \quad \mathcal{R}_2^\alpha = \gamma(\beta, p) \Theta(\alpha; r/(p-r)) \leq \gamma(\beta, p) \Theta(\alpha; \theta).$$

The latter estimate holds since $p \geq p_0 = r + r/\theta$. The term corresponding to the third summand in (4.10) is estimated as follows

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \exp[-\alpha \rho(o, x)] \sum_{y \sim x, y \in \Lambda^c} \frac{2\beta}{n(x)n(y)} |\xi(y)|^p \\ \leq \mathcal{R}_3^\alpha(\Lambda) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2\beta e^\alpha \sum_{x \in \Lambda^c} \exp[-\alpha \rho(o, x)] |\xi(x)|^p, \end{aligned}$$

which is finite whenever $\xi \in L^p(\mathbb{V}, w_\alpha)$, and tends to zero as $\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$. In a similar way, we get

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \exp[-\alpha \rho(o, x)] \sum_{y \sim x, y \in \Lambda} \frac{2\beta}{\lambda n(x)n(y)} M_y(\lambda, p, \Lambda; \xi) \\ \leq \mathcal{R}_4^\alpha(\Lambda) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{2\beta e^\alpha}{\lambda} \|M(\lambda, p, \Lambda; \xi)\|_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that β and λ are supposed to obey (4.7). Then from the estimates obtained above we get the following

$$(4.17) \quad \|M(\lambda, p, A; \xi)\|_\alpha \leq \frac{\mathcal{I}_1^\alpha + \mathcal{I}_2^\alpha + \mathcal{I}_3^\alpha(A)}{1 - 2\beta e^\alpha / \lambda},$$

which yields

$$(4.18) \quad M_x(\lambda, p, A; \xi) \leq C(\lambda, p, x, \xi),$$

for some $C(\lambda, p, x, \xi) > 0$, which is independent of A , but obviously depends on the choice of the root o .

4.2. Weak compactness of the local Gibbs specification. The result just obtained allows us to prove the next statement, crucial for establishing the relative weak compactness of the family $\{\pi_A(\cdot|\xi)\}_{A \in \mathbf{V}}$ and the corresponding integrability estimates.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $p \in [p_0, q]$ and $\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, \overline{\alpha}]$ be fixed. Then for every $\lambda > 0$ and $\xi \in L^p(\mathbf{V}, w_\alpha)$, one finds a positive constant $C(p, \alpha; \lambda, \xi)$, such that for all $A \in \mathbf{V}$,*

$$(4.19) \quad \int_\Omega \exp(\lambda \|\omega\|_{p, \alpha}^p) \pi_A(d\omega|\xi) \leq C(p, \alpha; \lambda, \xi).$$

Furthermore, for the same λ , one finds a positive constant $C(p, \alpha; \lambda)$, such that for all $\xi \in L^p(\mathbf{V}, w_\alpha)$,

$$(4.20) \quad \limsup_{A \rightarrow \mathbf{V}} \int_\Omega \exp(\lambda \|\omega\|_{p, \alpha}^p) \pi_A(d\omega|\xi) \leq C(p, \alpha; \lambda).$$

Proof. By (2.7) and (2.11), for any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \exp(\lambda \|\omega\|_{p, \alpha}^p) \pi_A(d\omega|\xi) &= \exp\left(\lambda \sum_{x \in A^c} |\xi(x)|^p w_\alpha(x)\right) \\ &\times \int_\Omega \prod_{x \in A} [\exp(\delta |\omega(x)|^p)]^{\lambda w_\alpha(x)/\delta} \pi_A(d\omega|\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Now we pick δ , such that

$$\frac{\lambda}{\delta} \sum_{x \in A} w_\alpha(x) \leq 1,$$

and apply in (4.21) the Hölder inequality (4.9). This yields, see (4.5) and (4.11),

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \exp(\lambda \|\omega\|_{p, \alpha}^p) \pi_A(d\omega|\xi) &\leq \exp\left(\lambda \sum_{x \in A^c} |\xi(x)|^p w_\alpha(x)\right) \\ &\times \exp[(\lambda/\delta) \|M(\delta, p, A; \xi)\|_\alpha]. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.17) the set $\{\text{RHS}(4.22)(A) | A \in \mathbf{V}\}$ is bounded for every fixed $\xi \in L^p(\mathbf{V}, w_\alpha)$. We denote its upper bound by $C(p, \alpha; \lambda, \xi)$ and obtain (4.19).

The estimate (4.20) follows from (4.22) by (4.15), (4.17), and the fact that $\xi \in L^p(\mathbb{V}, w_\alpha)$. $\square$

Corollary 4.3. *For every $\xi \in L^p(\mathbb{V}, w_\alpha)$, the family $\{\pi_\Lambda(\cdot|\xi)\}_{\Lambda \in \mathbb{V}} \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ is relatively weakly compact.*

Proof. For obvious reasons, the balls $\{\omega \mid \|\omega\|_{p,\alpha} \leq R\}$, $R > 0$, are compact in Ω for any fixed $\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, \overline{\alpha}]$ and $p \in [p_0, q)$. Thus, the proof follows from (4.19) by Prokhorov's theorem. $\square$

We recall that $C_b(\Omega)$ stands for the set of bounded continuous functions $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. To prove that the accumulation points of the family $\{\pi_\Lambda(\cdot|\xi)\}_{\Lambda \in \mathbb{V}} \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ are Gibbs measures, we use the fact that this family possesses the following (Feller) property. For a fixed $\Lambda \in \mathbb{V}$, we consider

$$(4.23) \quad C_b(\Omega) \ni f \mapsto \pi_\Lambda(f|\cdot) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_\Omega f(\omega) \pi_\Lambda(d\omega|\cdot).$$

Lemma 4.4. *For every $\Lambda \in \mathbb{V}$, (4.23) maps $C_b(\Omega)$ into itself.*

The proof of this lemma is quite standard. The boundedness of $\pi_\Lambda(f|\cdot)$ is immediate. Its continuity follows from the continuity of W , see Assumption 2.1, and the estimates (4.17) and (4.9) by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. For more details, we refer the reader to the proof of the corresponding lemma in (15).

Corollary 4.5. *For every $p \in [p_0, q)$ and $\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, \overline{\alpha}]$, the set $\mathcal{G}_{p,\alpha}$ is non-void.*

Proof. For every $\Lambda \in \mathbb{V}$ and $\xi \in L^p(\mathbb{V}, w_\alpha)$, by (2.7) each $\pi_\Lambda(\cdot|\xi)$ is supported by the set

$$\{\omega = \omega_\Lambda \times \xi_{\Lambda^c} \mid \omega_\Lambda \in \Omega_\Lambda\},$$

which yields

$$(4.24) \quad \pi_\Lambda[L^p(\mathbb{V}, w_\alpha)|\xi] = 1.$$

Let us fix some $\xi \in L^p(\mathbb{V}, w_\alpha)$. By Corollary 4.3 there exists an increasing sequence $\{\Lambda_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, which exhausts $\mathbb{V}$, such that $\{\pi_{\Lambda_n}(\cdot|\xi)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ weakly converges to a certain $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. Let us show that this μ also solves the DLR equation. For any Λ , one finds $n' \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\Lambda \subset \Lambda_n$ for all $n \geq n'$. For such n and $f \in C_b(\Omega)$, by (2.8) we have

$$(4.25) \quad \int_\Omega \pi_\Lambda(f|\omega) \pi_{\Lambda_n}(d\omega|\xi) = \pi_{\Lambda_n}(f|\xi).$$

Then we pass here to the limit $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and obtain that $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$, see (2.10) and Lemma 4.4. To prove that μ is supported by $L^p(\mathbb{V}, w_\alpha)$ we show that this measure obeys the estimate (3.8). For $\lambda > 0$, we set

$$(4.26) \quad F_N(\omega) = \exp \left[\lambda \min \left\{ \|\omega\|_{p,\alpha}^p; N \right\} \right], \quad N \in \mathbb{N},$$

which is a lower semi-continuous function on Ω . Then by (4.20) and the weak convergence $\pi_{\Lambda_n}(\cdot|\xi) \rightarrow \mu$, we have

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} F_N(\omega) \mu(d\omega) &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} F_N(\omega) \pi_{\Lambda_n}(d\omega|\xi) \\ &\leq C(p, \alpha; \lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where the latter constant is the same as in (4.20). Thereafter, the proof of (3.8), with the same constant, follows by B. Levi's monotone convergence theorem. Hence, $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_{p,\alpha}$. $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1. Just above we have proven that the accumulation points of the family $\{\pi_{\Lambda}(\cdot|\xi)\}$, $\xi \in L^p(\mathbf{V}, w_{\alpha})$, obey (4.20). Let us extend this to all $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_{p,\alpha}$. For such μ , by (2.9), Fatou's lemma, and the estimate (4.20) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} F_N(\omega) \mu(d\omega) &= \limsup_{\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbf{V}} \int_{\Omega} \left[\int_{\Omega} F_N(\omega) \pi_{\Lambda}(d\omega|\xi) \right] \mu(d\xi) \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left[\limsup_{\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbf{V}} \int_{\Omega} F_N(\omega) \pi_{\Lambda}(d\omega|\xi) \right] \mu(d\xi) \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left[\limsup_{\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbf{V}} \int_{\Omega} \exp(\lambda \|\omega\|_{p,\alpha}^p) \pi_{\Lambda}(d\omega|\xi) \right] \mu(d\xi) \\ &\leq C(p, \alpha; \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Then we again apply B. Levi's theorem and obtain (3.8). The proof of (3.7) follows by (4.18) along the same line of arguments.

In view of (3.8), by Prokhorov's theorem the set $\mathcal{G}_{p,\alpha}$ is relatively weakly compact. Clearly, all its accumulation points solve the DLR equation (2.10); hence, $\mathcal{G}_{p,\alpha}$ is weakly compact. $\square$

5. REPULSIVE GRAPHS

In the remaining part of the paper, we present a family of unbounded degree graphs, which obey the estimate (2.3). A crucial property of such graphs is that vertices of large degree are located at large distances from each other.

5.1. The family of graphs and the main statement. For $n_* \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$(5.1) \quad \mathbf{V}_* = \{x \in \mathbf{V} \mid n(x) \leq n_*\}, \quad \mathbf{V}_*^c = \mathbf{V} \setminus \mathbf{V}_*.$$

Definition 5.1. For an integer $n_* > 2$ and a strictly increasing function $\phi : (n_*, +\infty) \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$, the family $\mathbb{G}(n_*, \phi)$ consists of those graphs $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$, for which the path distance obeys the condition

$$(5.2) \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbf{V}_*^c : \quad \rho(x, y) \geq \phi[n(x, y)],$$

where

$$(5.3) \quad n(x, y) = \max\{n(x); n(y)\}.$$

No restrictions are imposed on $\rho(x, y)$ if either x or y belongs to V_* .

Let us make some comments. For a given $x \in V_*^c$, for

$$K(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{y \in V \mid \rho(y, x) < \phi[n(x)]\},$$

by (5.2) one has that $K(x) \cap V_*^c = \{x\}$, i.e., such x ‘repels’ all vertices $y \in V_*^c$ from the ball $K(x)$. For the sake of convenience, we shall assume that $K(x)$ contains the neighborhood of x , which is equivalent to assuming that

$$(5.4) \quad \phi(n_* + 1) > 1.$$

The graphs introduced and studied in (3) were defined by a condition, which can be written in the form, cf. eqs. (3.8) and (3.9) in (3),

$$(5.5) \quad \rho(x, y) \geq \phi[m(x, y)], \quad m(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{n(x); n(y)\}.$$

In this case, a vertex x ‘repels’ from the ball $\{y \mid \rho(y, x) < \phi[n(x)]\}$ only those y ’s, for which $n(y) \geq n(x)$. We employ (5.2) rather than (5.5) in view of its application in Lemma 5.4 below, see Remark 5.5 for further comments. The concrete choice of the function ϕ in Theorem 5.2 is discussed in Remark 5.8 below.

Theorem 5.2. *Let G be in $\mathbb{G}(n_*, \phi)$ with ϕ having the form*

$$(5.6) \quad \phi(b) = v \log b [\log \log b]^{1+\varepsilon}, \quad v, \varepsilon > 0, \quad b \geq n_* + 1,$$

where v and ε are such that (5.4) holds. Then for any $\theta > 0$, there exists $\underline{\alpha} \geq 0$, which may depend on θ , n_* , v , and ε , such that $\Theta(\alpha, \theta) < \infty$ whenever $\alpha > \underline{\alpha}$.

The proof of Theorem 5.2 is given at the very end of this subsection. It is preceded by and based on Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4, which in turn are proven in the remaining part of the paper. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in V$, we set

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} S(N, x) &= \{y \in V \mid \rho(x, y) = N\}, \\ B(N, x) &= \{y \in V \mid \rho(x, y) \leq N\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(5.8) \quad T_x(\alpha, \theta) = \sum_y [n(y)]^{1+\theta} \exp[-\alpha \rho(x, y)], \quad \alpha, \theta > 0.$$

Lemma 5.3. *Let G be in $\mathbb{G}(n_*, \phi)$ with ϕ obeying (5.4). Then for every positive θ and α ,*

$$(5.9) \quad \Theta(\alpha, \theta) \leq n_*^\theta (e^\alpha + 1) T_o(\alpha, \theta).$$

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\mathbf{G}$ be as in Theorem 5.2. Then for every $\theta > 0$, there exists $a > 0$, which may depend also on the parameters of the function (5.6), such that, for any $x \in \mathbf{V}$, there exist $N_x \in \mathbb{N}$, for which*

$$(5.10) \quad G_\theta(N, x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{y \in S(N, x)} [n(y)]^{1+\theta} \leq \exp(aN),$$

whenever $N \geq N_x$.

Remark 5.5. A condition like (5.5) could guarantee that the estimate (5.10) holds only for $N = N_k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for some increasing sequence $\{N_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N}$. This would not be enough for proving Theorem 5.2.

PROOF OF THEOREM 5.2. By (5.8) and (5.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_x(\alpha, \theta) &\leq \sum_{N=0}^{N_x} \exp(-\alpha N) \left(\sum_{y \in S(N, x)} [n(y)]^{1+\theta} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{N=N_x+1}^{\infty} \exp[-(\alpha - a)N]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the proof of the theorem follows by (5.9) with $\underline{\alpha} = a$. $\square$

5.2. A property of the balls in repulsive graphs. The proof of Lemma 5.4 is based on a property of the balls $\mathbf{B}(N, x)$ in the graphs $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}(n_*, \phi)$, due to which one can control the growth of the maximum degree of $y \in \mathbf{B}(N, x)$. Here we do not suppose that ϕ has the concrete form of (5.6).

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$ be in $\mathbb{G}(n_*, \phi)$ with an arbitrary increasing function $\phi : (n_*, +\infty) \rightarrow (1, +\infty)$. Then, for every $x \in \mathbf{V}$, there exists $N_x \in \mathbb{N}$, such that*

$$(5.11) \quad \max_{y \in \mathbf{B}(N, x)} n(y) \leq \phi^{-1}(2N),$$

whenever $N \geq N_x$.

Proof. Given x , let $\tilde{x}$ be the vertex in $\mathbf{V}_*^c$ which is closest to x , see (5.1). If there are more than one such vertices at the same distance, we take the one with the highest degree. For this $\tilde{x}$, we have the following possibilities: (i) $\rho(x, \tilde{x}) \geq \phi[n(\tilde{x})]/2$; (ii) $\rho(x, \tilde{x}) < \phi[n(\tilde{x})]/2$. The latter one includes also the case $\tilde{x} = x$, i.e., where x itself is in $\mathbf{V}_*^c$. In case (i), we set $N_x = 1$, which means that (5.11) holds for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, if $N < \rho(x, \tilde{x})$, then the ball $\mathbf{B}(N, x)$ contains only vertices $y \in \mathbf{V}_*$, for which $n(y) \leq n_* \leq \phi^{-1}(2N)$ for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$. If $N \geq \rho(x, \tilde{x})$ and $\max_{y \in \mathbf{B}(N, x)} n(y) = n(\tilde{x})$, one has $N \geq \rho(x, \tilde{x}) \geq \phi[n(\tilde{x})]/2$, which yields (5.11) also for this case. Finally, let $\max_{y \in \mathbf{B}(N, x)} n(y) = n(z)$ for some $z \neq \tilde{x}$, which means that $n(z) > n(\tilde{x})$. In this case, by (5.2) we have $\rho(\tilde{x}, z) \geq \phi[(n(z))]$, and

$$(5.12) \quad 2N \geq \rho(x, z) + \rho(x, \tilde{x}) \geq \rho(\tilde{x}, z) \geq \phi[(n(z))],$$

which yields (5.11) for this case as well.

If (ii) holds, we let x_1 be the closest vertex to x , such that $n(x_1) > n(\tilde{x})$. Again, we take that of the highest degree if there are more than one such vertices. By (5.2) we have $\rho(\tilde{x}, x_1) \geq \phi[n(x_1)]$. If for $N \geq N_x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \rho(x, x_1)$, one has $\max_{y \in B(N, x)} n(y) = n(x_1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} N &\geq \rho(x, x_1) \geq \phi[n(x_1)] - \rho(x, \tilde{x}) \geq \phi[n(x_1)] - \phi[n(\tilde{x})]/2 \\ &\geq \phi[n(x_1)]/2, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (5.11). Finally, let $\max_{y \in B(N, x)} n(y) = n(z)$ for some $z \neq x_1$, which means that $n(z) > n(x_1)$. In this case, $\rho(x_1, z) \geq \phi[(n(z))]$, and we obtain (5.11) by applying (5.12) with $\tilde{x}$ replaced by x_1 . $\square$

5.3. Proof of Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4. First we prove an auxiliary statement. Recall that by $\vartheta(x, y)$ we denote a path with endpoints x and y . A path is called *simple* if none of its inner vertices are repeated. For $m \leq n$, let $\vartheta' = \{x_0, \dots, x_m\}$ and $\vartheta = \{y_0, \dots, y_n\}$ be such that $x_0 = y_k$, $x_1 = y_{k+1}, \dots, x_m = y_{k+m}$ for some $k = 0, \dots, n - m$. Then we say that ϑ' is a *subpath* of ϑ , and write $\vartheta' \subset \vartheta$. For a path ϑ , by V_ϑ we denote the set of all its vertices.

Let $\Sigma_N(x)$ denote the family of all simple paths of length N originated at x . Then, for every $y \in S(N, x)$, there exists $\vartheta \in \Sigma_N(x)$, such that $\vartheta = \vartheta(x, y)$. We use this fact for estimating the cardinality of $S(N, x)$.

Proposition 5.7 (cf. Assertion 6 of (3)). *In any graph G , for any $x \in V$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, one has*

$$(5.13) \quad |S(N, x)| \leq |\Sigma_N(x)| \leq \max_{\vartheta \in \Sigma_N(x)} \prod_{y \in V_\vartheta \setminus \{x_N\}} n(y).$$

Proof. The proof will be done by induction in N . For $N = 1$, the estimate (5.13) is obvious. For any $N \geq 2$, we have

$$(5.14) \quad |\Sigma_N(x)| \leq n(x) \max_{y \sim x} |\Sigma_{N-1}^x(y)|,$$

where $\Sigma_{N-1}^x(y)$ is the corresponding family of paths in the graph which one obtains from G by deleting the edge $\langle x, y \rangle$. Every $\vartheta \in \Sigma_N(x)$ can be written in the form $\vartheta = \{x\tilde{\vartheta}\}$ with $\tilde{\vartheta} \in \Sigma_{N-1}^x(y)$ for some $y \sim x$. Then by the inductive assumption we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Sigma_N(x)| &\leq n(x) \max_{y \sim x} \max_{\tilde{\vartheta} \in \Sigma_{N-1}^x(y)} \prod_{z \in V_{\tilde{\vartheta}} \setminus \{x_N\}} n(z) \\ &\leq \max_{\vartheta \in \Sigma_N(x)} \prod_{z \in V_\vartheta \setminus \{x_N\}} n(z), \end{aligned}$$

that completes the proof. $\square$

PROOF ON LEMMA 5.4. We are going to prove that the estimate (5.10) holds with N_x being as in Lemma 5.6 and a given by

$$(5.15) \quad a = (1 + \theta)\sigma + \log n_* + \frac{2e}{v} \sum_{k=k_*}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^{1+\varepsilon}},$$

$$\sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max \{2/v; e\}.$$

For any $N \geq N_x$, by (5.11) and (5.13) we obtain

$$(5.16) \quad G_\theta(N, x) \leq \exp \left\{ (1 + \theta) \log \phi^{-1}(2N) + \max_{\vartheta \in \Sigma_N(x)} \sum_{z \in V_\vartheta \setminus \{x_N\}} \log n(z) \right\}.$$

By (5.6) we have

$$(5.17) \quad \phi^{-1}(2N) \leq \exp(\sigma N),$$

where σ is as in (5.15). If x is as in the case (i) considered in the proof of Lemma 5.6, and $N < \phi(n_* + 1)/2$, then $V_\vartheta \subset V_*$ for any $\vartheta \in \Sigma_N(x)$. In this case, the second summand in $\{\cdot\}$ in (5.16) does not exceed $N \log n_*$, which certainly yields (5.10).

To handle the case of $N \geq \phi(n_* + 1)/2$ we use the sequence $\{c_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, where $c_k = \exp(e^k)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let k_* be the least $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c_{k_*+1} \geq n_* + 1$. Then we set $b_{k_*} = n_* + 1$ and $b_k = c_k$ for $k > k_*$. Let k_N be the largest k , such that $b_k \leq \phi^{-1}(2N)$. For $k = k_*, \dots, k_N$ and a given $\vartheta \in \Sigma_N(x)$, let m_k^ϑ be the number of vertices $y \in V_\vartheta$, such that $n(y) \in [b_k, b_{k+1}]$. Given $\tau \in (0, N)$, for any $\vartheta \in \Sigma_N(x)$, the number of vertices in V_ϑ which are away from each other at distance at least τ is $1 + N/\tau$, at most. Therefore,

$$m_k^\vartheta \leq m_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 + N/\phi(b_k) \leq 2N/\phi(b_k).$$

Taking this into account by (5.6) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\vartheta \in \Sigma_N(x)} \sum_{z \in V_\vartheta \setminus \{x_N\}} \log n(z) &\leq N \log n_* + \sum_{k=k_*}^{k_N} m_k \log b_{k+1} \\ &\leq N \left(\log n_* + \frac{2e}{v} \sum_{k=k_*}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^{1+\varepsilon}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (5.17) and the latter estimate in (5.16) we obtain (5.10) also in this case. $\square$

Remark 5.8. Our choice of ϕ made in (5.6) was predetermined by the condition (5.17), which we used to estimate the first summand in $\{\cdot\}$ in (5.16), as well as by the following one

$$(5.18) \quad \sum_{k=k_*}^{\infty} \frac{\log b_{k+1}}{\phi(b_k)} < \infty,$$

which was employed for estimating the second summand in (5.16), for a concrete choice of the sequence $\{b_k\}_{k \geq k_*}$ made therein. In principle, any ϕ obeying such two conditions (for some choice of $\{b_k\}_{k \geq k_*}$) can be used. For $b_k = k$, $k \geq k_* = n_* + 1$, one can take $\phi(b) = b^{1+\varepsilon}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, which obviously obeys (5.17) and (5.18) but imposes a stronger repulsion, see (5.2). Our choice (5.6) seems to be optimal.

PROOF ON LEMMA 5.3. In view of (5.4), we have that $\rho(x, y) \geq 2$ for any $x, y \in V_*^c$; hence, for two adjacent vertices, at least one should be in V_* . Taking this into account by (2.2) and the triangle inequality we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(\alpha, \theta) &= \sum_x [n(x)]^\theta \left(\sum_{y \sim x} [n(y)]^\theta \right) \exp[-\alpha \rho(o, x)] \\ &\leq n_*^\theta e^\alpha \sum_y [n(y)]^{1+\theta} \exp[-\alpha \rho(o, y)] \\ &\quad + n_*^\theta \sum_x [n(x)]^{1+\theta} \exp[-\alpha \rho(o, x)], \end{aligned}$$

which yields (5.9), see (5.8). $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to Philippe Blanchard and Michael Röckner for valuable discussions and encouragement.

REFERENCES

- [1] ALBEVERIO, S., KONDRATIEV, Y., KOZITSKY, Y. AND RÖCKNER, M. (2009). *Statistical Mechanics of Quantum Crystals. A Path Integral Approach*. (to appear)
- [2] ALBEVERIO, S. AND ZEGARLIŃSKI, B. (1990). Construction of convergent simplicial approximation of quantum fields on Riemannian manifolds. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **132** 39–71. MR 1069200 (92c:81119)
- [3] BASSALYGO, L. A. AND DOBRUSHIN, R. L. (1986). Uniqueness of a Gibbs field with a random potential—an elementary approach. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **31** 572–589; *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **31** 651–670 (Russian). MR 0881577 (88i:60160)
- [4] BURIONI, R. AND CASSI, D. (2005). Random walks on graphs: ideas, techniques and results. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **38** R45–R78. MR 2119174 (2006b:82059)
- [5] BURIONI, R., CASSI, D., AND VEZZANI, A. (2004). Random walks and physical models on infinite graphs: an introduction. In *Random walks and geometry*, ed. V. A. Kaimanovich, 35–71, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin. MR 2087779 (2005h:60019)
- [6] CASSANDRO, M., OLIVIERI, E., PELLEGRINOTTI, A., AND PRESUTTI, E. (1977/78). Existence and uniqueness of DLR measures for unbounded

- spin systems. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* **41** 313–334. MR 0471115 (57 #10854)
- [7] CLARK, L. AND GUTMAN, I. (2008). The exponent in the general Randić index. *J. Math. Chem.* **43** 32–44. MR 2449405
- [8] DE ANGELIS, G. F., DE FALCO, D., AND DI GENOVA, G. (1986). Random fields on Riemannian manifolds: a constructive approach. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **103** 297–303. MR 0826866 (87g:81063)
- [9] FUJIWARA, K. (1995). Eigenvalues of Laplacians on a closed Riemannian manifold and its nets. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **123** 2585–2594. MR 1257106 (95j:58171)
- [10] GEORGII, H.-O. (1988). *Gibbs Measures and Phase Transitions*. de Gruyter, New York. MR 0956646 (89k:82010)
- [11] GEORGII, H.-O., HÄGGSTRÖM, O. AND MAES, C. (2001) The random geometry of equilibrium phases. In *Phase transitions and critical phenomena*, eds. C. Domb and J. L. Lebowitz, Vol. 18, 1–142, Academic Press, San Diego, CA. MR 2014387 (2004h:82022)
- [12] HATTORI, K., HATTORI, T., AND WATANABE, H. (1987). Gaussian field theories on general networks and the spectral dimensions. *Progr. Theoret. Phys. Suppl.* **No. 92** 108–143. MR 0934668 (89k:81118)
- [13] HÄGGSTRÖM, O. (2000). Markov random fields and percolation on general graphs. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **32** 39–66. MR 1765172(2001g:60246)
- [14] HÄGGSTRÖM, O. SCHONMANN, R. H., AND STEIF, J. E. (2000) The Ising model on diluted graphs and strong amenability. *Ann. Probab.* **28** 1111–1137. MR 1797305 (2001i:60169)
- [15] KOZITSKY, Y. AND PASUREK, T. (2007). Euclidean Gibbs measures of interacting quantum anharmonic oscillators. *J. Stat. Phys.* **127** 985–1047. MR 2317266 (2008d:82009)
- [16] LEBOWITZ, J. L. AND PRESUTTI, E. (1976). Statistical mechanics of systems of unbounded spins. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **50** 195–218. MR 0446251 (56 #4579)
- [17] LYONS, R. (2000). Phase transitions on nonamenable graphs. Probabilistic techniques in equilibrium and nonequilibrium statistical physics. *J. Math. Phys.* **41** 1099–1126. MR 1757952 (2001c:82028)
- [18] LYONS, R. (1989). The Ising model and percolation on trees and tree-like graphs. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **125** 337–353. MR 1016874 (90h:82046)
- [19] PASUREK, T. (2007). *Theory of Gibbs measures with unbounded spins: probabilistic and analytic aspects*. Habilitation Thesis, Universität Bielefeld, available as SFB 701 Preprint 08-101, 2008.
- [20] SIMON, B. (1974). *The $P(\phi)^2$ Euclidean (quantum) field theory*. Princeton Series in Physics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. MR 0489552 (58 #8968)
- [21] WALD, R. M. (1994). *Quantum field theory in curved spacetime and black hole thermodynamics*. Chicago Lectures in Physics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL. MR 1302174 (95i:81176)

- [22] WEITZ, D. (2005). Combinatorial criteria for uniqueness of Gibbs measures. *Rand. Struct. Algorithms* **27** 445–475. MR 2178257 (2006k:82036)

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT BIELEFELD, D 33615, GERMANY

E-mail address: kondrat@math.uni-bielefeld.de

INSTYTUT MATEMATYKI, UNIwersYTET MARII CURIE-SKŁODOWSKIEJ, 20-031 LUBLIN,
POLAND

E-mail address: jkozi@hektor.umcs.lublin.pl

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT BIELEFELD, D 33615, GERMANY

E-mail address: tpasurek@math.uni-bielefeld.de